REMARKS

Status of the Claims

Claims 1-23 and 34-38, and 40-50 are currently pending in the Office Action, of which claims 1, 11, 18, 35-36 and 40-41 are in independent form.

Claims 1, 11, 18, 35-36, and 40-41 are currently amended. No claims are canceled or added by this Amendment. Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

Summary of Examiner Interview

Applicants express appreciation for courtesies extended to their representative, James C. Larsen, in an in-person interview conducted April 6, 2010. In the interview, Examiners Ke Xiao and Sumati Lefkowitz discussed with Mr. Larsen the current interpretations of the claims, particularly the difference between mere "motion" and "motion blur". Examiner Xiao agreed that the term "motion blur" may be properly interpreted in view of the specification (as described in more detail below).

Also discussed was the distinction between a backlight and liquid crystal display panel. Examiner asserted that a "panel" could be interpreted as including a backlight if not distinctly claimed. Examiner agreed that the amendments to distinctly recite a backlight and a liquid crystal display panel in appropriate claims are likely to further distinguish the applied art. Moreover, the Examiner agreed that amendments to indicate signals/voltages/levels are supplied to picture elements of a liquid crystal display panel likely further distinguish the applied prior art.

Rejection Assumed to be Withdrawn

In the Office Action dated August 11, 2009, claims 1-23 were rejected under § 112, 1st paragraph. Arguments in support of withdrawing the rejection were presented in the Amendment dated October 30, 2009. Since no mention is made of the § 112 rejections in the present Office Action, Applicant believes that the rejection was successfully traversed and is now withdrawn. Confirmation of such withdrawal is respectfully requested.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Office Action rejects claims 1-23, 34-38 and 40-50 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 2002/0067332 issued to Hirakata (hereinafter "Hirakata") in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,151,572 issued to Shirahama (hereinafter "Shirahama"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

A complete discussion of the Examiner's rejection is set forth in the Office Action, and is not being repeated here.

It appears throughout the Office Action "amount of motion" in the applied art has been equated with "motion blur" of the present claims. However, the two terms are not synonymous. As discussed in detail in the specification, two video segments, for example, may have identical "amount of motion", but very different amounts of motion *blur*. Broadcasts of two baseball games, for example, one recorded indoors in bright lighting and the other recorded outdoors at night, may have very similar amounts of motion. However, motion *blur* associated with the broadcast signals would naturally be quite different due at least in part to differences in shooting conditions. (*See, e.g.*, ¶¶[0021]-[0022] of PGPUB.) Even one of nominal skill in the art may be familiar with the comparative challenges in capturing an in-focus photograph in poor lighting conditions. In some instances blur may appear because the recording medium captures all it "sees" while the shutter is open; if significant motion occurs while the shutter is open, blur is recorded. Information relating to motion blur may be used by the liquid crystal display device to aid detection of a type of content of an image so that the type of content is matched with appropriate stored illumination durations corresponding to the amount of motion blur in that type of content.

Claims 1 and 18 are amended to indicate that the "section that detects a type of content of an image to be displayed on a liquid crystal display panel" detects the type of content based on at least "electronic program information other than the image signal to be displayed *and on additional information as to motion blur*".

The combination of Hirakata and Shirahama provides no consideration of motion blur nor even a way to derive such information such that it could be used. Consequently, Hirakata does not store illumination duration values that correspond to motion blur, and the combination of references does not include a section that can variably control an illumination duration (or a ratio

of display duration) based on a detected type of content (detected based on electronic program information and additional information as to motion blur). Since Hirakata and Shirahama do not disclose or make obvious every feature of claims 1 and 18 as amended, a *prima facie* case of obviousness is not presently demonstrated.

Accordingly, applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection and reconsideration and allowance of claims 1 and 18, and of claims 2-9 and 19-23 and 50 which depend therefrom.

Independent claims 11, 35, 36, 40 and 41 are amended to recite, in part, that gray scale voltages or levels, and/or image signals and black display signals, are applied to picture elements of the liquid crystal display panel. This terminology is well known in the art to refer to individual elements of a liquid crystal panel. As agreed in the Examiner Interview, portions of a backlight are not generally referred to as "picture elements" (or pixels).

The Office Action further asserts that the "liquid crystal display panel" may be broadly construed to include a backlight, and that grayscale levels/voltages could be applied to the backlight. Although Applicants do not necessarily agree that one of ordinary skill in the art would consider the LCD panel of an LCD display to include a backlight, claim 11 is further amended to more distinctly recite both a backlight and a liquid crystal display panel.

Consequently, independent claims 11, 35, 36, 40, 41 recite a combination of elements not disclosed or made obvious by the applied art and are believed to be in condition for allowance. Claims 12-17, 37, 38, and 42-49 depend from one of these claims and are believed to be in condition for allowance for at least the same reasons. Withdrawal of the rejection, and reconsideration and allowance of claims 11-17, 35-38, and 40-49 are respectfully requested.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance.

In view of the above amendment, Applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact James C. Larsen, Registration No. 58,565 at the telephone number of the undersigned below to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Director is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge any fees required during the pendency of the above-identified application or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448.

Dated: April 12, 2010

Respectfully submitted,

By _____

Michael R. Cammarata
Registration No.: 39,491
James C. Larsen
Registration No.: 58,565
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP
8110 Gatehouse Road, Suite 100 East
P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747
703-205-8000
Attorneys for Applicant